

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,827	11/28/2001	John Misselbrook	P282714	1394
9629	7590 06/09/2004	EXAMINER		NER
MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP			EASHOO, MARK	
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1732	
			DATE MAILED: 06/09/2004	ı

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·-·		Ь.	
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	_	
		09/889,827	MISSELBROOK, JOHN		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.	1732		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address		
THE - Exte after - if the - if NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIOnsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streeply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r reply within the statutory minimum of thin riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AE	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3	1 March 2004.			
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ 7	This action is non-final.	action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allo	wance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merits is		
•	closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D). 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Dispositi	on of Claims				
4)	Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the applicat	ion.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 18 is/are withdraw				
5) 🗌	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.				
7)⊠	Claim(s) 4-17 is/are objected to.				
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.			
Applicati	on Papers				
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.			
·	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)∐ a		by the Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to t	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	rection is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International Bur- tee the attached detailed Office action for a least	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage		
Attachment	• •				
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) ∐ Interview S Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date		
3) 🛛 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/t No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/04, 7/01</u> .		formal Patent Application (PTO-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of claim group I, claims 1-17, in the reply filed on 31-MAR-2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim 18 has been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected claim group, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 31-MAR-2004.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements filed 31-MAR-2004 and 23-JUL-2001 comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. Accordingly, they have been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Claim Objections

Claims 4-17 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 4-17 not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Judd (US Pat. 4,065,289) when taken with Sandell (US Pat. 5,474,971).

Regarding claim I: Judd teaches the claimed process of forming water dispersible granules, comprising: preparing a premix comprising an excipient and active material (example 5); and extruding the mixture into granules (example 5).

Although Judd does not specifically state that a paste is not formed, it is inherent that only 3 ml of water into about 90 grams of solids is insufficient to form a paste.

Judd is silent with respect to the granules being water dispersible. Nonetheless, Sandell (1:10-35) which forms substantially the same type of granules from similar materials provides evidence that the granules of Judd are water dispersible.

Regarding claim 7: Judd teaches the addition of a minor amount of water, a liquid, to a mixture containing urea (example 5). Since urea is 100% soluble in water, it is inherent that the small amount of water would at least be adsorbed into/onto the urea (ie. an active solid).

Regarding claim 3: Judd teaches substantially homogenous final granules since a specific average N:P:K ratio is obtained (example 5). It is self-evident or inherent that the pre-mix before extrusion would have the same homogeneity.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached form PTO-892 which recites addition prior art that teaches the basic state of the art.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Eashoo, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-1197. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am-3pm EST, Monday - Friday.

Art Unit: 1732

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni can be reached on (571) 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark Eashoo, Ph.D. Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1732

6/4/04 me 09/J~104